



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,950	11/16/2000	Woon-II Kim	P56107	3781
8439	7590	01/26/2005	EXAMINER	
ROBERT E. BUSHNELL 1522 K STREET NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1202			TRAN, DOUGLAS Q	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2624		
DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/712,950

Applicant(s)

KIM, WOON-IL

Examiner

Douglas Q. Tran

Art Unit

2624

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 5-23 and 25 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557) and in combination of Salgado et al. (US Patent No. 5,898,592).

As to claim 1, Kakigi teaches a system controlling a printing device, comprising:
the printing device (102 in fig. 1) including a plurality of sheet storage unit (107 in fig. 1) storing sheets on which images will be formed and a plurality of sheet outputting units (108 in fig. 1) outputting the sheets on which the image are formed;
a manipulation panel (104 in fig. 1) including a display unit displaying a print state and an input unit input print setting conditions (more information is describes on col. 4, lines 5-9);
a host computer (col. 8, lines 59-61) inputting the print setting conditions and giving a print command to output the work result of a user to the printing device; and
a printing device controller (i.e., the video controller 103 in fig. 4) including a host interface unit (402 in fig. 4) interfacing the host computer, a manipulation panel interface unit (401 in fig. 4) interfacing the manipulation panel, and a printing device interface unit (406 in fig. 4) interfacing the printing device, the printing device controller processing signals received (col. 8, lines 53-65).

Although Kakigi teaches, with respect to col. 11, lines 45-48, the fixed bin selection mode is such that fixed discharging into only the bin specified by the external unit 101 is performed, that means the exclusive use for the external unit 101 is set with respect to at least one of the sheet outputting position units when the external unit instructed; and the various users (col. 11, lines 58-60) can communicate with a printer via the same external unit 101, Kakigi does not teach an exclusive use for a certain user being set by a printing device controller (i.e., the video controller 103 in fig. 4) with respect to at least one of the sheet outputting position units when instructed.

Salgado teaches a printing device controller (i.e., a controller 100 in fig. 1) for setting an exclusive use for a certain user with respect to at least one of the sheet outputting position units when instructed (fig. 5 indicates an exclusive use for each user is set with respect to at least one of the sheet outputting position units “or bins” “col. 12, lines 60-67”; and col. 12, lines 40-42).

It would have been obvious to modify the video controller 103 of Kakigi for setting an exclusive use for a certain user with respect to at least one of the sheet outputting position units when instructed as taught by Salgado. The suggestion for modifying the video controller of Kakigi can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth above by Salgado because such a modification would increase the functionalities of the printer for easily controlling each of bins to each user and allowing the user to keep track the locations of his outputted print jobs.

3. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakigi and Salgado as applied to claim 1 above, and further in combination with Kakuno (US Patent No. 6,574,003 B1) and Tang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,629).

As to claim 3, Kakigi and Salgado discloses every feature discussed in claim 1, and Kakigi further teaches the input unit including a cassette designating unit, a sheet output position designating unit, and a user display panel (col. 8, lines 56-58 and col. 4, lines 5-9 indicate that a panel unit 104 including the input unit “i.e., various switches or buttons for operations” for setting and command the printer to perform a predetermined operation by operating the panel unit 104; and a user display panel “i.e., liquid crystal display devices”. The input unit would include a cassette designating unit “i.e., feeding unit”, and a sheet output position designating unit “i.e., output bin or discharge unit” because, with respect to col. 13, lines 18-31, the user at the panel operation of the printer can set or reset to the feeding and discharge system. Thus, the input units of the printer panel would include a cassette designating unit “i.e., feeding unit” and a sheet output position designation unit “i.e., discharge unit”).

However, Kakigi does not explicitly teach: 1) the input unit of the printer panel includes a unit designating a number of print jobs, and 2) an exclusive use display column, an exclusive time designating unit.

Tang, in the same field of endeavor “display panel”, teaches the input unit of the printer panel (38 in fig. 3) includes a unit designating a number of print jobs (col. 7, lines 54-57); and

Kakuno, in the same field of endeavor “display panel”, teaches an exclusive use display column (please see “PRINT PANEL DISPLAY” in fig. 7 or 8; col. 8, lines 45-48 and 54-55) and an exclusive time designating unit (i.e., the expansion time threshold value; col. 9, lines 27-29). Thus, the printer panel includes the exclusive use display column in which the exclusive time designating unit “i.e., the expansion time threshold value” would be selected by the user).

It would have been obvious to modify the control panel 104 of Kakigi for includes a unit designating a number of print jobs as taught by Tang, and an exclusive use display column, an exclusive time designating unit as taught by Kakuno. The suggestion for modifying the control panel of Kakigi can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth above by Tang and Kakuno because the modified control panel would increase the advantage and functionalities of the printer by adding more options of the functional setting on the control panel. Such a modification would allow the user to easily set more optional setting for his print jobs.

As to claim 4, the combination of Kakigi, Salgado, Kakuno and Tang discloses every feature discussed in claim 3, and Kakigi further teaches the printing device controller (103 in fig. 1) processing a command from the host computer (i.e., a host computer connects to external 101 in fig. 1) or the manipulation panel (104 in fig. 1, col. 4, lines 5-12) and controlling the printing device to process the print command according to set conditions (col. 3, lines 54-63, col. 6, lines 25-31).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 5-23, 25 are allowed.

Claims 5, 11 are independent claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As to claim 5, the reasons to allow this claim based on pages 18-19 of the argument of the applicant, and Shimura (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,069) cannot establish a prima facie case of obviousness in order to modify the deficiency of Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557).

Art Unit: 2624

5. As to claim 11, the prior art such as Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557), Salgado et al. (US Patent No. 5,898,592), Kakuno (US Patent No. 6,574,003 B1) and Tang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,629), including an updated electronic text search, would not teach step of “determined whether an exclusive use is to be set with respect to a sheet outputting position unit when the sheet storage unit is set to be exclusively used; determined whether there is a print command when it is determined that the exclusive use is not set with respect to the sheet outputting position unit or when the corresponding sheet outputting position unit is set to be exclusively used”.

6. Claims 2 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claim 2, the prior art such as Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557) and in combination of Salgado et al. (US Patent No. 5,898,592), including an updated electronic text search, would not teach “display unit displaying a combination of “a print state, a name of an exclusive user, and an exclusive cassette, the exclusive user being the only user performing a print on the printing device, an exclusive cassette being the sheet storage unit used exclusively by the exclusive user”.

As to claim 24, the prior art such as Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557) and in combination of Salgado et al. (US Patent No. 5,898,592), including an updated electronic text search, would not teach “the printing device controller determining whether an exclusive use is to be set with respect to at least one of the sheet outputting position unit when the sheet storage

unit is set to be exclusively used and determining whether there is a print command when it is determined that the exclusive use is not set with respect to the one of the sheet outputting position units or when the corresponding sheet outputting position unit is set to be exclusively used”.

Conclusion

Applicant's **amendment** with respect to independent claim 1 and claims 3-4, which depend on claim 1, filed 9/08/04 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. This action is made **final**.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
Jan. 14, 2005

Douglas Q. Tran